

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action (“Action”), Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejection of the claims and seek reconsideration thereof. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2 and 7-12 are rejected. In this response, claim 1 is amended, withdrawn claims 13-14 are cancelled and no claims are added.

I. Claim Amendments

Applicants respectfully submit herewith amendments to claim 1. Claims 8, 13 and 14 are cancelled. Claim 1 is amended to recite the elements of “the second porous polymer film comprising an inorganic material wherein the inorganic material is added in an amount of 1 to 15% by weight, based on the total weight of the polymer of the second porous polymer film.” Support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found, for example, in now cancelled claim 8 and page 6, lines 21-23 and Example 1 on page 8 of the Application.

Applicants respectfully submit the amendments do not add new matter and are supported by the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request consideration and entry of the amendments to claim 1.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

In the outstanding Action, claims 1-2 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 11-080395 issued to Tojo et al. (“Tojo”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

It is axiomatic to a finding of anticipation that each and every element of the rejected claim be found within a single prior art reference.

In regard to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Tojo fails to disclose or render predictable at least the elements of “the second porous polymer film comprising an inorganic material wherein the inorganic material is added in an amount of 1 to 15% by weight, based on the total weight of the polymer of the second porous polymer film” as recited in amended claim 1.

Rather, Tojo discloses in paragraph [0022] that the mixed weight ratio of inorganic particles and a binder is 500 or less parts, preferably 100 or less parts, more preferably 50 or less parts of the binder to 100 parts of the inorganic particles. Tojo also discloses that "it will become difficult to acquire a sufficient reinforcing effect if the ratio of the binder exceeds 500 parts."

It is noted from paragraph [0022] of Tojo that the minimum weight ratio of the inorganic particles to the binder is 100/500. Therefore, Tojo fails to disclose the amount of 1 to 15% by weight of the inorganic material as claimed.

Since Tojo fails to teach each and every element of claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited prior art reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Tojo.

In regard to claims 2 and 7-12, these claims depend from claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated by Tojo, claims 2 and 7-12 are further not anticipated by the cited prior art reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Tojo.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Questions regarding this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: September 3, 2008

By: *Stacie Sundquist*
Stacie J. Sundquist, Reg. No. 53,654

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone (408) 720-8300
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on September 3, 2008.

Suzanne Johnson